1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA * * * 6 7 VAL DAY, et al., Case No. 2:12-CV-577 JCM (CWH) 8 Plaintiff(s), ORDER 9 v. 10 FORMAN AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, 11 Defendant(s). 12 13 Presently before the court is defendant Forman Automotive Group's (hereinafter 14 "defendant") third emergency motion to continue trial date. (Doc. # 113). 15 On May 20, 2015, defendant filed its first emergency motion to continue trial. (Doc. # 16 106). In that motion, defendant stated that a number of its witnesses had planned vacations in the 17 coming months. Accordingly, defendant asked for a continuance from the existing trial date of 18 June 15, 2015, to a date not sooner than September 7, 2015. (Doc. # 106). 19 In its first motion, defendant listed the specific dates of its witnesses' vacation plans. 20 Specifically, defendant represented that its president, Mr. Forman, would be out of the country for 21 two weeks beginning June 14, 2015; and again from July 25, 2015, through August 7, 2015. 22 Defendant also noted vacation plans of other witnesses from July 3, 2015, through July 4, 2015; 23 July 21, 2015, through July 24, 2015; July 26, 2015, through August 2, 2015; and for the week of 24 August 17, 2015. Finally, defense counsel stated that he had a family vacation scheduled from 25 "August 29, 2015 through July 5, 2015." (Doc. # 106). 26 Plaintiff Val Day ("plaintiff") filed a response to defendant's motion, opposing defendant's 27 request on the grounds that a three-month delay would be prejudicial. (Doc. # 108). Reviewing 28

defendant's representations, the court selected the single available week among all the purported vacation plans and set trial for July 13, 2015. (Doc. # 109).

On June 9, 2015, defendant filed its second motion to continue, seeking a continuance to July 27, 2015. In that motion, defendant claimed that Mr. Forman had a "nearly year-long planned family vacation on July 12-19, 2015." Defendant stated that Mr. Forman would be available for trial on any date after July 27, 2015. (Doc. # 110).

On June 10, 2015, the court denied defendant's second motion to continue. The court noted that defendant had omitted the July 12, 2015, vacation from the extensive list in its prior motion, misrepresenting the availability of its witnesses to the court. The court had relied on defendant's prior representations in setting the current trial date and therefore declined to entertain any further continuance requests by defendant. (Doc. # 111).

On June 11, 2015, the court issued its order regarding trial, confirming the trial date of July 13, 2015. (Doc. # 112). On June 16, 2015, defendant filed the instant motion, citing Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1). Defendant again asks the court to continue the trial to a date after July 27, 2015. (Doc. # 113).

In this motion, defense counsel asks that the court grant a continuance based on excusable neglect. Defense counsel states that it relied upon information provided by defendant in filing its first motion to continue, but failed to compare that information with the dates set forth in the motion. Defense counsel notes that defendant had advised counsel of Mr. Forman's unavailability during the week of July 13, 2015, but that counsel negligently failed to include this information in the motion and failed to ask defendant to review the motion before filing. (Doc. # 113).

Defendant acknowledges that the court's prior order declined to entertain any further requests for a continuance. However, defendant states that it is filing its motion based on the court's order regarding trial, which states that "the court will not grant a continuance to any party absent a showing of good cause." (Doc. # 112).

The court does not find good cause to grant the instant motion. The court has many other cases on its docket and relied on defendant's representations in setting the instant trial date. This

Case 2:12-cv-00577-JCM-CWH Document 114 Filed 06/23/15 Page 3 of 3

case has been pending since 2012, and no further continuances will be granted absent a showing of good cause. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that defendant's third emergency motion to continue, (doc. # 113), be, and the same hereby is, DENIED. DATED June 23, 2015. allu C. Mahan UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge